REMARKS

The above-identified patent application has been amended and Applicants respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and again examine the claims as amended.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Secord et al. in view of Betts. Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Secord et al in view of Betts and further in view of Steele. Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Secord et al in view of Betts and further in view of Huang et al. Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Secord et al in view of Roberts. Claims 14-15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Secord et al in view of Roberts and further in view of Rakib et al.

Secord et al teaches an error correction technique for use in a multi-channel code division multiple access (CDMA) system.

Betts teaches a technique for noise suppression.

The present invention teaches a technique to reduce the effects of heavy absorption of direct signal path propagation and the effects of multipath in an Orthogonal Frequency Modulation (OFDM) like system.

It is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 is patentable over Secord et al in view of Betts, since Secord et al in view of Betts neither describes nor suggests " ... a Forward Error Correction (FEC) encoder to encode digital data to provide a plurality of symbol blocks, each one of the plurality of symbol blocks having a plurality of symbols; an interleaver to map each symbol of one of the plurality of symbol blocks into a different one of the plurality of subbands; and a Walsh subband encoder to encode each symbol within each one of the plurality of subbands".

Appl. No. 09/802,280 Reply to Office Action of December 12, 2005

As Claims 2 through 6 depend from Claim 1 and cite additional structure, they too are allowable for analogous reasons.

Independent Claim10 is neither described nor suggested by the references since the references taken separately or in combination neither describe nor suggest the steps of "...encoding baseband data with a Reed Solomon forward error correction algorithm to provide symbol blocks, each symbol block having a plurality of symbols; and interleaving each symbol of one of the symbol blocks across a plurality of coherent subbands wherein each symbol is mapped to one of the plurality of coherent subbands; and subband-encoding each coherent subband with a low rate Walsh code."

Independent Claim13 is neither described nor suggested by the references since the references taken separately or in combination neither describe nor suggest "...a Forward Error Correction (FEC) encoder to encode digital data to provide a plurality of symbol groups, each one of the plurality of symbol groups have a plurality of symbols, the FEC encoder using a Reed Solomon FEC code; an interleaver to map each one of the plurality of symbols into a corresponding one of a plurality of coherent subbands;"

As Claims 12, 14 and 15 depend from Claim 13 and cite additional structure, they too are allowable for analogous reasons.

Applicants have submitted herewith a Petition for an Extension of Time for three (3) months with authorization to charge payment to Deposit Account No. 500845 to cover the costs of the petition.

The Assistant Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 500845.

Accordingly, re-examination and reconsideration are requested in view of the above amendment and remarks.

If the Examiner has any questions regarding this Amendment or this application, he or she is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigning attorney.

Dated: 9 June 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Daly, Crowley, Mofford & Durkee, LLP

By:

Donald F. Mofford Reg. No. 33,740

Attorney for Applicant(s)

354A Turnpike Street - Suite 301A

Canton, MA 02021-2714 Tel.: (781) 401-9988, Ext. 13

Fax: (781) 401-9966

dfm@dc-m.com